Interagency Human Trafficking Task Force
Data Collection and Information Sharing Subcommittee Meeting
January 14, 2013
Convened at 9:00 am

Members present: Amy Farrell (co-chair), Susan Goldfarb, Lori Ann Bertram, David Carabin
Members absent: Chief Tom Pasquarello (co-chair), Chris Carroll; Mike Coelho (EOPSS)
Massachusetts Attorneys General Staff Present: Britte McBride, Jocelyn Jones

The group opened with a discussion of the primary goals of the data collection and information sharing system:

- Statistics/evaluation of program impact
- Service provision
- Intelligence
- Case coordination

The group briefly discussed other models of data collection, no other state with statewide human trafficking data collection. Some models in New York (state-wide certification system tracks information on certified victims), attempt to build intelligence sharing system for law enforcement in Florida scrapped due to budget cuts. Texas AG's office collects data for statewide report to legislature, utilizes HTRS.

There are some national systems that collect some information on human trafficking. For example:

HTRS – Human Trafficking Reporting System –web-based data entry system that collects investigation level information including detailed information about suspects and victims for all investigations opened by law enforcement partners in federally funded human trafficking task forces. Bureau of Justice Assistance.

TIMS – The OVC counterpart to HTRS. Access-based data collection system that collects information about victims that are served under the OVC grants for the victim service provider partners in the federally funded human trafficking task forces. Office of Victims of Crime.

NHTRC – Information about the characteristics of cases that are reported to the national hotline. Polaris Project.

Can learn from some of the lessons of the national data collection systems but there are few good state models. There are models for data collection and information sharing in Massachusetts and elsewhere for other crimes/events that would be useful to consult.
- PACT – centralized data system where service providers have access to see some of the information on at risk kids and their families from law enforcement, though the service providers do not currently report their case management information or information about clients they work with into the PACT system.

- Child fatality review team utilizes multidisciplinary model –*Legislature gives authority to DA's to compile information from medical examiner, medical files, service provider records and case/government agency records for review by the review team. The legislature also grants team members access to review this information covered under HIPAA.*

Brainstorming on what the data collection and information sharing would do:
- Collect information for victims and suspects in same system – though access to victim or suspect information might be restricted by user.
- Look up system so you could see if a person was already in the system
- Access controls over specific data fields so that information can remain protected or confidential when needed. Who enters data and who has access to view data are two separate questions.
- Interest in the ability to enter information about persons who are at risk for trafficking that could be kept separate and information de-identified. Service providers may want to collect and track some basic information but would not want this information shared with law enforcement. Law enforcement may have similar interest in ongoing investigations where victims or suspects have not been identified or trafficking confirmed.
- Possibility that a case coordinator in a region or designated persons from a multidisciplinary team could have access to information that would link confidential id (e.g. victim name or suspect name) across records
- Could limit system to only case coordinator or members of multidisciplinary team who sign some type of memorandum of understanding about use of system and sharing of information. If only case coordinator has access to the system it is a different game of chase to get the information. This is a problem of HTRS and TIMS where the entry of information is limited to one or two people per task force. Those people may not know what is actually happening with a case or have enough information to meaningfully update the system. On the other hand, too many users threaten the security of the system, raises concerns about breeches of confidentiality and may result in poor data quality.
- A person or group (maybe AG's office) that can see everything in the system and provides appropriate access to the information
- System should allow information to be shared in cases where federal partners are involved. This is will require agreements from federal agency leadership.

Brainstorm on some identified challenges:
- Must strike a balance between having enough information in the system to make it useful and protecting the confidentiality of victim information and information about ongoing investigations
- Easier to share data on children who have had 51A filed, adults must consent to have their data shared
- The need to keep victim identification and information about ongoing investigations confidential, but limit of information sharing system that does not have names
- The trust and working relationship among multidisciplinary team members who will potentially have access to information in the data sharing system is key
- Some agencies may not be willing to participate. Getting agreement to share information across multiple partners including victim service providers, local law enforcement and federal law enforcement will be very challenging. Law enforcement will have particular

concerns about sharing any information that involves an ongoing investigation or intelligence on a criminal enterprise.

- Groups having to enter data on trafficking cases more than once. Most agencies and service provider have their own internal records management or case management systems. There would have to be a benefit of entering this information a second time into a shared system. The group was interested in the possibility that some information could be automatically populated (e.g. information from 51A, police incident report)
- Major challenges recording information about exploited immigrant populations. It would be helpful to have information on immigration status (this may determine types of services available and protections needed from law enforcement) but this information puts victims at risk and they may be less likely to come forward if they know that information would be shared. AG database on wage and hour violations does not include immigration status. Law enforcement agencies throughout the state operate with different rules about recording immigration status of victims or offenders. Concerns about ICE/HSI having access to immigration status information about potential victims.
- Building a system with the appropriate security controls to convince people to enter data will be expensive. May be best to pilot system in a single county/region.

The group discussed the need to involve an organization like IGIS, a private sector group that works with government agencies to develop a request for proposal document that will specify what the state would want a vendor to do in creating an information sharing system. This group or others like it understand the issues related to federal and state laws (e.g. 28 CFR part 23) regarding the protection of information in an intelligence sharing systems. The group recognized that IT departments within participating agencies would have to participate in conversation about the development of the system but they would not likely be able to develop or manage the system themselves.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

Next meetings scheduled for February 11th at 10:00 at AG's office
March 11th at 10 at Northeastern University
April 8th at 10 TBD (final subcommittee meeting)

Appendix: Potential Data Fields

Information we would want to collect (*information from our meeting supplemented with data fields from SEEN form and HTRS, TIMS systems). Person information could be nested within information about the incident/victimization or kept separate.*
- Person information
    - First and last name of victim or suspect (protected information, names could be replaced with unique identifiers in the system)
    - Home address/city
    - Basic information about victim or suspect
        - Age range (classification as juvenile or adult)
        - Gender

- Race
- Citizenship (collected in federal systems but may not be needed in state system)
- Custody status for children
- Abuse/trauma history
- Criminal history
- Gang affiliation
- School/work affiliation
- Indicators of substance abuse
- Involvement with DYS, DCF, other government agencies
- Indication of how person was identified
- Arrest been made
  - Date
  - Arresting agency
  - Bail status
  - Arrest charge
  - Prosecution status, charges, adjudication, sentence
- Narrative about victim or suspect information such as risk factors, history of running away, aliases, known associates
- Indication of types of services provided or needed

- Incident or characteristics of the victimization information
  - Date, time and location of incident or victim identification
  - Location of incident or victim identification
  - Type of trafficking involved
    - Sex
    - Labor
  - Characteristics of the trafficking/exploitation
    - Recruitment
    - Movement
    - Type of exploitation
  - Narrative
- Agencies involved